

REMARKS

Applicants reply to the Office Action dated June 26, 2007 within the three month statutory period for reply. Claims 1-16 were pending in the application and the Examiner rejects claims 1-16. Support for the amendments may be found in the originally-filed specification, claims, and figures. The amendments to the independent claims may be found at, for example, paragraph [0139] and Figures 8A – 8D of the present published application. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Pursuant to Applicants' counsel's explanation provided to the Examiner on September 21, 2007, Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider the Examiner's assertions on page 4, 3rd paragraph regarding "any computer store address in the United States" because Applicants' presently claimed invention includes a global recycle support system. More specifically, the Examiner admits that Grenchus, Rousseau, and Teveler do not explicitly disclose that the recording section includes information for specifying a country, which is suitable for dismantling the commodity. However, Applicants respectfully assert that none of the cited references discloses the idea of constructing a recycle support system at a global view point.

The Examiner rejects claims 1-16 as being obvious over Grenchus et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,054,824 ("Grenchus"), in view of Rousseau, et al., U.S. Publication No. 2002/0001001 ("Rousseau"), and further in view of Teveler et al., US Publication No. 2001/0034663 ("Teveler"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Amended Claim 1 requires at least the following features:

- (a) ". . . said country which is suitable for dismantling the commodity being different from a country of manufacture of the commodity, so as to realize a global recycling system".

Claims 9, 15, and 16 have been amended in a similar manner.

According to a commodity recycling method of the present invention, a commodity collected from a first user is sold or leased to a second user based on an estimated remaining life

of the commodity, and thus the life of the commodity is effectively used. Also, information for specifying a country which is suitable for dismantling the commodity can be used, where the country which is suitable for dismantling the commodity is different from the country of manufacture of the commodity (as shown, e.g., in Figures 8A to 8D of P1). As such, the presently claimed invention includes a global recycling system for effectively recycling commodities worldwide.

More specifically, it is possible to minimize the energy required for transportation to a consuming country on the way to the final dismantling country by using the most suitable final dismantling country information for each commodity category (e.g., car and airplane) as shown in Figures 8B and C of P1. As admitted by the Examiner in the outstanding Official Action, none of the cited references explicitly describe the feature of the presently claimed invention, namely, “information for specifying a country which is suitable for dismantling the commodity”. Further, none of the cited references disclose the feature of constructing a recycle support system from a global view point, **where the countries of manufacture, use, and dismantling are different (as shown, e.g., in Figures 8A to 8D of P1).**

None of the cited references disclose the features shown in Figures 8A to D. In other words, none of the cited references describe the feature of the present invention “information for specifying a country which is suitable for dismantling the commodity, said country which is suitable for dismantling the commodity being different from a country of manufacture of the commodity, so as to realize a global recycling system” (emphasis added).

Moreover, the Examiner has not provided any prior art reference to teach that the country of dismantling is different from the country of manufacture. Furthermore, the Examiner has not provided any prior art reference to teach a global recycling system. Therefore, it would not have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill at the time of the present invention to include the aforementioned limitation within Grenchus, Rousseau, and Teveler for specifying a country, which is suitable for dismantling the commodity, where this country for dismantling the commodity is different from the country of manufacture, so as to realize a global recycling system.

Accordingly, Applicants assert that neither Grenchus, Rousseau, Teveler, nor any combination thereof, disclose or suggest a recording section with at least "information for specifying a country which is suitable for dismantling the commodity. . . said country which is suitable for dismantling the commodity being different from a country of manufacture of the commodity, so as to realize a global recycling system" as similarly recited in independent claims 1, 9, 15 and 16.


Claims 2-8 and 10-14 variously depend from independent claims 1 and 9, so claims 2-8 and 10-14 are differentiated from the cited references for the same reasons as set forth above, in addition to their own respective features.

In view of the above remarks and amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims properly set forth that which Applicants regard as their invention and are allowable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the Examiner's convenience, if that would help further prosecution of the subject application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. **19-2814**.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 21, 2007

By: _____


Howard I. Sobelman
Reg. No. 39,038

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
400 E. Van Buren
One Arizona Center
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
Phone: 602-382-6228
Fax: 602-382-6070
Email: hsobelman@swlaw.com